REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11, and 12 stand rejected and claims 3-5, 8-10, and 13-15 are objected to. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 2-5, 8-10 and 13-15. By this Amendment, claims 1, 6, and 11 have been amended. The amendments made to the claims do not alter the scope of these claims, nor have these amendments been made to define over the prior art. Rather, the amendments to the claims have been made to improve the form thereof. In light of the amendments and remarks set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that each of the pending claims is in immediate condition for allowance.

Applicant has amended the specification to correct for a typographical error. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11, and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,339,585 ("Hulyalkar"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Among the limitations of independent claim 1 not present in the cited reference is a connection controlling unit "a connection controlling unit for connecting said disconnected client terminal to said searched client terminal by said search controlling unit independent of a central controller". This limitation is not present in the cited reference.

In Hulyalkar, as noted in the Office Action at page 3, the ad hoc network still requires a central controller to control the signaling/control information and

10

available slot allocation. It is the data information between the wireless terminal and the central controller that is distributed such that each wireless terminal, during its slot, piggybacks its control information to the central controller where, among other control messages, it specifies the number of slots required. Thus, through the central controller, the wireless terminal searches for an empty slot.

In contrast, as explicitly recited in Applicant's claim 1, the connection controlling unit for connecting said disconnected client terminal to said search client terminal by said search control unit independent of a central controller. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable over the cited reference.

Independent claims 6 and 11 each require "connecting said disconnected client terminal to said searched client terminal independent of a central controller." As discussed above with respect to claim 1, Hulyalkar explicitly requires the central controller. See, column 8, lines 29-37 and Office Action at page 3. As such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 6 and 11.

Claims 2, 7, and 12 depend from, and contain all the limitations of claims 1, 6, and 11, respectively. These dependent claims also recite additional limitations which, in combination with the limitations of claims 1, 6, and 11, respectively, are neither disclosed nor suggested by Hulyalkar and are also believed to be directed towards the patentable subject matter. Thus, claims 2, 7, and 12 should also be allowed.

Applicant has responded to all of the rejections and objections recited in the Office Action. Reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance for all of the pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

If the Examiner believes an interview would be of assistance, the Examiner is welcome to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Dated: February 10, 2004   Respectfully submitted,

By
Ian R. Blum
    Registration No.: 42,336
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
    OSHINSKY LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas - 41st Floor
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 835-1400
Attorney for Applicant

IRB/mgs

12